DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 903 CE 060 431

TITLE	A Student-Centered Approach to Adult Literacy in Allegheny County: Adoption of a Nationally-Recognized Model Small Group Instruction in Math. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Div. of Adult Basic and Literacy Education Programs.
PUB DATE	Jul 91
CONTRACT	98-1050
NOTE	45p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *Adult Programs; *Cooperative Programs; *Literacy Education; *Mathematics Instruction; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; *Small Group Instruction; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS	353 Project; *Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council PA

ABSTRACT

The Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council offered a pilot program for instruction in mathematics in conjunction with its literacy program. The small group collaborative model was used. The council trained 20 tutors in a 12-hour basic reading workshop, then started 13 groups in 9 neighborhoods. Groups of about five students and a tutor met once each week for 1.5 hours. Sessions were held in 12-week cycles to provide convenient entry and exit points and opportunities for evaluations. Attendance at 75 to 80 percent of the class meetings was to be rewarded with a certificate. Eighty students received instruction through these groups. Cooperation among students, tutors, program staff, and the literacy staff was essential for the success of the program. Evaluation of the project showed that inclusion of the mathematics groups strengthened and enriched the literacy program. (Ten appendixes provide examples of the following project materials: a certificate, a student goal checklist, an interviewer letter, a newsletter article, a list of opportunities for volunteers, mathematics and reading tutor's group evaluation forms, a students' group evaluation form, a mathematics journal, and a tutor's communication form.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342903

OPEN UP A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

A Student-Centered Approach to Adult Literacy in Allegheny County: Adoption of a Nationally-Recognized Model Small Group Instruction in Math

Final Report

July 1991

CE060431

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

A PILOT PROGRAM FOR SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION IN MATH

OFFERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH

A LITERACY PROGRAM

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council
100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206, (412) 661-7323

Executive Director: Donald G. Block
Project Director: Susan H. Evans

This project was conducted with support from federal funds under Section 353 of the Adult Education Act granted by the Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Adult Basic Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 176126-0333.

Contract No: 98-1050
Amount: $8,000.00
Fiscal Year: July 1, 1990 - June 30, 1991

This report is a result of a project supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

Copies of this report have been submitted to AdvancE and Eric.

RECEIVED
SEP 0 4 1991
DIVISION OF ADULT EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract ii

Introduction iii

Chapter 1 1

Chapter 2 3

Chapter 3 5

Chapter 4 7

Chapter 5 9

Chapter 6 11

Conclusions 5

Appendix

Bibliography

ABSTRACT

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council developed a Pilot Program for Small Group Instruction in Math Offered in Conjunction with a Literacy Program. This project was planned and delivered in four parts:

1. Preplanning
2. Training
3. Instruction
4. Evaluation

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council successfully trained twenty tutors and initiated thirteen groups in nine neighborhoods. Eighty students participated in the groups.

This project should be of interest to program directors, trainers, and staff of adult literacy and adult basic education programs.

INTRODUCTION

Before we undertook this project the Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council's program did not include formal math instruction. The basic program provided reading, writing, and spelling instruction to students on levels 0 to 8 via volunteer one-on-one literacy tutors. These tutors were trained in a 12-hour basic reading workshop.

Many clients of our council are innumerate as well as functionally illiterate and so suffer many practical inconveniences as well as loss of self-esteem.

GPLC has always striven to provide a learner-centered program which is responsive to students' goals.

During the goal setting portion of the New Students Interview, a number of students requested math instruction. Several commonly mentioned reasons for enrollment in the literacy program have obvious connections to math instruction, e.g. the need to learn to write checks, to handle shopping responsibilities, and to pay bills. Students received the necessary math instruction only if the tutor provided it voluntarily. As a result, not all students' needs were being met.

Follow-up of students completing GPLC's program and going on to GED programs indicated that while our students were well prepared to handle the reading material, they required much remedial math instruction.

These concerns led us to expand our instruction to include math as part of our basic program.

We decided to provide the instruction through the small group collaborative model. This is efficient, using one instructor to meet the needs of several students. It also takes advantage of the benefits of the collaborative approach for the learner.

We anticipated the groups would have about five students and a tutor meeting once a week for 1 1/2 hours. Students would not necessarily be working at the same level. Collaboration would be encouraged. We planned 12-week sessions/cycles to provide convenient entry and exit points for students and tutors and to provide the opportunity to restructure based upon evaluations. Attendance of 75 to 80 % of the meetings was to be rewarded with a certificate. (exhibit 1) After a brief break each course continued for another 12 weeks.

GPLC's program divided Allegheny County into thirteen geographic areas. Each area is supervised by an area coordinator whose office is located within that area to facilitate delivery of service and interaction with students and volunteers.

The math groups were looked upon as a supplement to the basic program at the beginning of the project. To promote the inclusion of math into the total literacy program, we encouraged the two groups of tutors (math and reading) to communicate and reinforce one another's instruction.

The objectives of the program were:

1. Identification of presently enrolled and incoming students who expressed an interest in math and recruitment for the math group.
2. Recruitment of volunteers to teach the small math groups.
3. Development of supplemental tutor training in small group instruction.
4. Selection of tools for assessment, instruction, and evaluation.
5. Development of a system to provide for communication between math instructors and one-on-one literacy tutors.
6. Collection of data to determine if the opportunity to enter the small group increases the attractiveness of a literacy program and increases the students' tenacity in the program.

Our objective was to train twelve volunteers to teach 36 students in 12-week courses located in six convenient neighborhood locations.

Between July 1, 1990 and June 30, 1991 twenty math group tutors were trained, thirteen groups were started in nine areas, and 80 students received instruction through these groups. Evaluation was ongoing and changes were made in response to student, tutor, and staff comments and concerns.

This report should be of interest to program providers, volunteers, trainers, and staff of adult literacy and basic

education programs. Anyone seeking to incorporate regular math instruction into a literacy program and/or the small group format may find this information helpful.

The cooperation and participation of the volunteers, program director, training coordinator, and all the area coordinators was essential for the accomplishment of this project.

Permanent copies of this report are filed with the Division of Adult Basic and Literacy Education Programs, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

and with

AdvancE
P.D.E. Resource Center
Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

CHAPTER ONE

Goal 1. Identification and Recruitment of Learners to Participate in the Math Group Project

Each area coordinator began by reviewing the records of the area's matched and waiting list students to identify those who had shown any interest in math instruction. This was done by studying the goal checklist, and any anecdotal notes and comments on the tutor's monthly reports. These students and their tutors were notified that math groups were being formed. Students were invited to register through their coordinators.

As new students enrolled in the program they were informed of the math option during the initial interview. Students were invited to join a math group immediately while waiting to be matched with a reading tutor.

The format was described to the students as a small group, not a traditional class, made up only of GPLC students like themselves. GPLC's guidelines require all students to meet with their tutor twice a week. We allowed students to substitute the math group meeting for one of the regular sessions when the student's schedule would not permit three sessions per week. In most cases no attempt was made to limit students' math levels to a specific range of skills.

Since GPLC advertised one-on-one instruction, we anticipate strong resistance to the idea of joining a group. Surprisingly, the resistance was minimal. The students accepted the idea more readily than some staff members did. This led us to question our belief that literacy students all desire complete confidentiality. We were reminded to make no assumptions, but rather to consult with the learners for accurate information.

We initiated the first groups in the areas in which students indicated interest in math instruction. These groups were open to students from other areas.

During the course of the year all student recruitment efforts were changed to reflect the addition of small group math instruction to the basic program. The students goal checklist was altered to include the item "Improve Math Skills." (exhibit 2) Intake Interviewers described the math group format to the students. (exhibit 3) Additional on-going recruitment was done through the student newsletter, word of mouth, referrals from other agencies, and students' invitations to other students to join their group. (exhibit 4)

Student recruitment was easily accomplished. By the end of the project 80 students had participated in the math groups. Of those, 10 had enrolled in GPLC's program only for the math instruction.

CHAPTER 2

Goal 2. Recruitment of Volunteers to Teach the Small Groups

GPLC's volunteer recruitment efforts are on going. All potential volunteers are interviewed to determine their most appropriate assignment with GPLC. Math group tutors must possess a pre-existing facility in math. They must be willing to attend all required training.

At the outset of this project the Volunteer Job Description did not include the Math Group Tutor assignment. Coordinators selected specific volunteers and approached them directly to become math tutors. The job description was altered to include the math group tutor position. (exhibit 5)

Volunteer recruitment is a problem in certain areas served by GPLC. This once-a-week tutoring assignment, as opposed to the twice-a-week usual assignment, is more appealing to many busy volunteers. Some experienced tutors continued in the program because this new option appealed to them.

Coordinators invited this project director to visit area tutor meetings to describe the math groups. These visits recruited more group tutors.

During the Basic Reading Workshop a staff member promotes the math groups through five-minute "advertisement."

//

By introducing the group format at this time we are planting the seeds for recruitment of future tutors.

Continued recruitment of math group tutors has been successful. This type of volunteer work has brought more engineers, computer scientists and accountants to our organization.

CHAPTER THREE

Goal 3. Development of Supplemental Training in Group Process

GPLC requires volunteer tutors to attend the Basic Reading Workshop. This workshop is designed to provide volunteers with an awareness of the adult learner's needs and the strategies necessary to teach reading in a one-on-one setting.

We developed additional training for math group tutors adapting the Basic Workshop information to meet the diverse needs of a group of students. Since each tutor had a pre-existing facility with math, no attempt was made to teach math.

The SMALL GROUP TRAINING AGENDA included:

1. STRUCTURE OF GPLC'S MATH PROGRAM (30 minutes)

This portion explained the development of the math groups and how they fit into the overall program. It defined the goals and structure of the groups and the responsibilities of all participants.

2. GROUP DYNAMICS (45 minutes)

Since we wanted to form collaborative groups, the emphasis was on developing group facilitators, rather than teachers.

The information provided to our tutors was a combination of information collected from experienced GPLC staff members and LVA'S SMALL GROUP TUTORING. This text explains the small group philosophy. It provides detailed instructions for implementing the small group format.

Much emphasis was placed on providing strategies to develop this collaborative atmosphere. One step in this process was leading the group members in listing guidelines for the group's handling of potential sources of conflict.

3. LESSON PLANNING AND SIMULATION (60 minutes)

Trainers provided volunteers with mock students and sample lessons from the text. The objective was to provide practice in planning a lesson that included some group activity and some individual instruction.

4. RECORD KEEPING (15 minutes)

This section included instructions on handling attendance, pre and posttesting, keeping student folders, and reporting to the area coordinator.

HANDBOOK

Each trainee was provided with a handbook containing record keeping forms, reading tutor communication forms, and math resources such as puzzles, supplementary worksheets and goal related lessons.

After each workshop, adjustments were made to the training based upon trainees' and active math tutors' comments. We conducted four workshops, each 2 1/2 hours, and trained 20 tutors to facilitate small math groups.

CHAPTER FOUR

Goal 4. Selection of Tools for Instruction, Assessment, and Evaluation

INSTRUCTION

We selected a text series which uses a pre and posttest format for each skill and covers the topics usual to the 0 to 8 levels. We also selected an alternate series which would be helpful for more basic students. We collected supplemental texts for a resource shelf. Each group was provided with flash cards, copies of tutor tips collected from a variety of sources to provide instructional advice, and a list of available supplementary texts.

ASSESSMENT

GPLC uses the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills to prepare diagnostic reading prescriptions and to measure progress. This instrument also includes math evaluations. We chose two forms to be used alternately for pre and posttesting. At the tutors' request, another test was created which more directly tested material taught in the text.

In some cases tutors created tests specific to a skill students were studying. In all cases, students' scores on pre and posttests were shared with them. In addition, tutors kept records of personal goal accomplishments to be considered in evaluating progress.

EVALUATION

We solicited comments from all tutors and students at the end of each 12-week session. Evaluation questionnaires were mailed to all math and reading tutors who participated in the project. (exhibits 6 and 7)

The project director telephoned each student at the completion of the course. The conversations were casual and explained that the purpose of the call was to obtain advice in order to make the groups better. The emphasis was on learning what the students liked best and least and on eliciting suggestions for improvements. Although the phone calls took some time, we felt that eliminating the need for the students to read and write was essential. (exhibit 8)

The project director also maintained contact with tutors and area coordinators throughout the project by visiting the groups and by telephone. All comments were shared with tutors and area coordinators. Improvements were made in response to evaluators' comments.

CHAPTER FIVE

Goal 5. Development of a System to Provide for Communication Between Math Instructors and One-on One Literacy Tutors

Even though the math groups involved the students with a separate tutor, we wanted to incorporate math instruction as a part of the whole program, not as a separate part. Math groups had a wide range of reading levels. We asked our math tutors to teach math, not reading.

During the supplemental training, the math tutcr was instructed to contact the students' reading tutors and invite them to attend the first meeting of the math group. At this "reception" the responsibilities of each participant were listed, information shared, and the tutors' communication form explained.

The first communication form we tried was a three-page math journal to be used for the 12-week cycle. There was space for the student, the math tutor, and the reading tutor to comment on each session. Math tutors were to note vocabulary terms, story problems, and concepts which the reading tutors should teach or reinforce. Students were asked to make a brief comment on their reaction to the lesson. The students were responsible for transporting this form and their math book to the reading and math sessions. This form was cumbersome and was discarded. (exhibit 9)

We revised the communication form to one page and removed the obligation of the student to do any writing. This form was more successful. (exhibit 10)

The most successful method of maintaining communication between both tutors was a combination of the written communication form and phone calls. Participation in the initial "reception" was essential to building the team concept. Reading tutors needed to understand the math program, examine the materials, be made aware of the communication form, and meet the math tutor. Thus, an attitude of working together to help the student resulted.

CHAPTER SIX

Goal 6. Collection of Data to Determine if the Opportunity to Enter the Small Math Group Increases the Attractiveness of a Literacy Program and Increases the Students' Tenacity in the Program

Collection of this data was the most difficult objective to accomplish. At all times our objective was to make the groups more "user friendly" and to encourage participation. Changes were made throughout the operation of this project to facilitate the development of math groups.

Students with a wide range of skill levels and program involvement entered the math groups. We preferred not to limit participation in any way.

These factors increased the number of variables involved in each comparison.

We compared two groups which met throughout the project year. Both met in the evening. Each group added a second tutor to the group during the year. One was made up of city residents; one was made up of suburban residents. We counted all students who were enrolled in each area during the contract year July 1, 1990 and June 30, 1991 and limited all measures to that 12-month period.

RETENTION IN THE PROGRAM

Students Receiving Reading Instruction Only

City Group - 62 students averaged 7.51 months

Suburban Group - 54 students averaged 6.66 months

Students Receiving Both Reading and Math Instruction

City Group - 7 students averaged 9.71 months

Suburban Group - 7 students averaged 9.14 months

Of the students in these two groups, those who participated in both math and reading instruction demonstrated greater retention in this program.

LITERACY GAINS

We compared literacy gains between the math group students and math/reading students using the BRIGANCE SURVEY OF ESSENTIAL SKILLS.

Students Receiving Reading Instruction Only
City Group - 62 students averaged +.19 levels in comprehension
Suburban Group - 54 students averaged +.68 levels in comprehension

Students Receiving Both Math and Reading Instruction
City Group - 7 students averaged +.85 levels in comprehension
Suburban Group - 7 students averaged +1.28 levels in comprehension

Of the students in these two groups, those who participated in both math and reading instruction demonstrated greater literacy gains. Within the design of this project it is not possible to prove the gains are the result of group participation or whether students who make more progress are more likely to participate in math groups.

INCREASED ATTRACTIVENESS

In Allegheny County availability of basic math instruction in convenient locations at convenient times is unique to GPLC.

As the project progressed, 10 students enrolled only for the math part of the program. Of these 10 students, 3 later became involved in other parts of the literacy program. Inclusion of math does seem to increase the attractiveness of a basic literacy program.

CONCLUSIONS

Each group differs form all others. The interaction of the group's members, their personalities, and their individual and common goals determine the final form of each group.

The group format is not appropriate for all students. Participation in a group should be strictly voluntary. Program staff may make a recommendation, but the student makes the final decision. In the case of a student who cannot or will not work in a group, placement with a tutor should be arranged.

The collaborative small group format worked well for GPLC. The students liked working with other students. Self-confidence increased when learners were given the opportunity to "teach" other learners. This does not occur in one-to-one tutoring. The synergy resulting from collaboration contributes to the accomplishment of student goals.

We observed improved attendance and retention in the literacy program. The peer support and social connections fostered a feeling of "family," as one student described it. A student who might otherwise leave the program now feels a connection and may choose to stay on instead of dropping out. We are now able to offer an alternative instructional setting to a student who is dissatisfied with the one-to-one setting.

Many students who participated in math groups were involved in other GPLC activities.

Volunteer recruitment expanded. Volunteers have a greater choice of assignments. Volunteers whose interests leaned toward math rather than reading now have a means to participate. Busy people who cannot fulfil the usual twice a week tutoring commitment can meet the once a week group schedule.

Math instruction moved from a supplemental to an integral part of the program. In order to accomplish this attitude of teamwork, both math and reading tutors must meet. A structured "reception" at the first group session provided the opportunity to initiate the required communication. Following that meeting, a written communication form continued the exchange of information.

Some reading tutors noticed improvement in study habits after their students joined the math group. In some cases, the enthusiasm resulting from the obvious success in the math class carried over into the reading sessions where progress was not so apparent.

The 12-week cycle of courses provided manageable intervals for group participants and staff. Short breaks between cycles allowed for adjustments to the group without loss of momentum.

Many groups contained a wide range of skill levels. In these cases we used two or more tutors. Formation of subgroups with similar skill levels enhanced collaboration

and facilitated provision of group activities. These subgroups may all share the same space. Tutors in this type of group felt three students to one tutor was effective.

Large diverse groups which were not reduced to smaller groups tended to become individuals sharing space for tutoring. In one group the instructional levels ranged from basic addition to algebra. The addition of more tutors did not solve the problem. Tutors experienced difficulty providing appropriate group activities. With no common goal or activity, collaboration did not develop. Students' interaction was reduced. The benefits of the group format were not available to these students and tutors.

Groups which formed to study a specific skill and/or groups which were more homogeneous found it easier to have one tutor matched with a larger number of students.

We chose not to set any upper instructional level limits on the math groups. The subject matter ranged from counting to algebra. As long as the tutor was willing and the materials were available, we provided the instruction. Advanced students form a group separate from the basic students.

Attendance was more constant in groups which worked collaboratively than in those which did not. Certificates were awarded to students who attended 75-80% of the meetings in a cycle. Many students valued the certificates enough to make arrangements to do make-up work in order to earn their certificates.

INSTRUCTION

Groups should be structured to enable students to work at their own pace by providing individual instruction as well as group activities. Students' progress should not be tied to other members' instructional needs.

Pretests and posttests should be used to determine a starting point and to demonstrate progress to the students. We used a variety of tests depending upon the purposes of the testing. All test results were shared with the student.

Each of the students felt he/she was accomplishing his/her goal. Posttesting and tutor observations confirmed this. Some students looked upon entering a group as a sign of progress. They regarded entry to the group as progressing to the next level in their program.

Instruction included teaching students practical application of computation skills. These lessons were useful for group activities.

TRAINING

Supplemental training in group process and lesson planning is needed to prepare a volunteer tutor for assignment to a group. The Basic Reading Workshop is a prerequisite.

GPLC's experience with math groups was so successful that it fostered the development of other special topic groups within GPLC's regular program.

Our small math group collaborative tutor training evolved into a single training workshop for all small group tutors. The lesson planning simulation portion of the training provides for the different needs of each type of group.

The difficulty that adult literacy programs have in attracting potential students is common knowledge. We believe an expansion of instructional offerings and formats in community-based settings increases the possibility of reaching more adult learners. Our small collaborative neighborhood groups accomplish this goal.

Based upon increasing enrollment in math groups and students comments, we concluded that math instruction should be available in all 0 to 8 literacy and ABE programs. It enriches the program and makes it more appealing to students. We registered 10 students who enrolled only for the math instruction. Of those 10, three later enrolled in other parts of the literacy program.

The concensus is that inclusion of the math groups strengthened and enriched GPLC's basic program. We consider this project a success.

APPENDIX

EXHIBITS

1. Certificates
2. Student Goal Checklist
3. Interviewer Letter
4. GPLC Newsletter Article "GPLC Launches Math Classes"
5. Volunteer Opportunities
6. Math Tutor's Group Evaluation Form
7. Reading Tutor's Group Evaluation Form
8. Student's Group Evaluation Form
9. Math Journal
10. Tutor's Communication Form

GREATER PITTSBURGH LITERACY COUNCIL, INC.

Basic Math Skills Certificate

This document certifies that

_____

has successfully completed a 12-week Basic Math Skills course conducted by Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council.

_____

Tutors

OPEN UP A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

Area Coordinator

Donald L. Block
Director

Date

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

Interviewer Accomplishment Checklist

Interviewer's Name _____ Date _____ Area _____

Learner's Name _____ Zip_____

Directions for the interviewer:

1. Discuss the main and most important reasons why the student has come to GPLC. Write these reasons below.

_____

_____

_____

2. Read the following list for additional ideas.

CONSUMER

___1. Read ads, labels, (food, sales, etc.)

___2. Read and use a bus schedule

___3. Read/write checks and money orders

___4. Read and process monthly bills

___5. Using telephone book

___6. Read maps

HEALTH AND NUTRITION

___1. Read and write recipes/follow diets etc.

___2. Read and follow directions on medicines

___3. Read a thermometer

PARENTING

___1. Read to children

___2. Help children with homework

(EXHIBIT 2)

OPEN UP A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

April 19, 1991

Dear _____,

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council. Without your help we couldn't accomplish our mission. Your encouragement and the information you collect and supply are crucial to the students' successful participation in the program.

As you know, we are constantly working to improve our basic reading and writing program to serve our students' needs more completely. As a result, we are now offering our students a choice of several ways to receive instruction. For basic instruction students can choose between the traditional one-on-one tutoring and the new option of meeting with a very small group of students for that instruction.

In addition, as a supplement to our basic program, students can choose to participate in any of the spelling, math or special topic groups which are forming throughout the county. A student's participation in any group is dependent upon his/her instructional needs.

For your information:

1. Only GPLC students are members of the group. All have similar instructional needs.

2. This is not a class, but a small group. There is more personal attention than in a class and more stimulation than in a one-on-one setting.

3. A reading group has 3-5 students, with an absolute maximum of 5 students.

4. Spelling, math and special topic groups supplement the basic program and may have 2-10 members and more than one tutor.

5. The staff will evaluate all factors and make a **recommendation** regarding the placement (one-on-one and/or group) that will provide the best opportunity for goal accomplishment.

6. Student and staff will discuss the recommendation and the student will make the final decision as to how he/she will participate in the program.

Please encourage the student to consider a group. Students participating in groups right now feel they are learning more, enjoying the interaction with the other students and accomplishing their goals quickly.

If you have questions, please call me directly at 661-7323 or speak with your area coordinator.

Yours truly,

Susan Evans

Susan Evans
Education Specialist

rrb

GPLC Launches Math Classes

Since the beginning of March, GPLC coordinators and volunteers have organized math classes in the South Hills, Sewickley, East Liberty, North Side and Homewood areas. The classes are part of a GPLC pilot program which will receive support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Karen Mundie, GPLC's Education Specialist, has been appointed Project Director.

Each class was conducted by two volunteers who received a special orientation to group instruction in addition to completing the twelve-hour GPLC tutor workshop. Students were admitted based on their desire to improve their math skills.

Mark Brazier and Audrey Claassen, engineers from Systems Modeling Corporation, taught the Sewickley class. Fred Levine and Tracy Black, employees in the credit department at PNB, volunteered to teach the North Side class. Eugenia Newman, GPLC's Homewood coordinator, and Alivia Clark, a VISTA volunteer working with GPLC, taught the Homewood class. Joe Micikas, an engineer working with Kaiser Engineering and Janice Nugent, a long distance operator with AT&T, taught the class in South Hills. Annie Futrell, a GPLC tutor who holds a Bachelor's in Elementary Education, and Helene Grant, founder of Nursing Services, Inc., taught the class in East Liberty.

Mark Brazier observed that having both a female and male instructor proved advantageous as a "gender gap seemed to exist with some of the students." He also advised potential volunteers to be aware of the underlying dynamics of these groups. Students are on various levels of skills and "there must be real empathy for students on lower levels." An aspect that he hadn't considered before is the amount of counseling that became a necessary part of the learning process in this situation.

Fred Levine observed that the class required a lot of individualized instruction. "If there are five students, there are five different levels of skills. Having two instructors is good; three would be even better."

A July meeting was held for the coordinators and instructors who were involved in the pilot program to plan the necessary changes and adjustments before the resumption of classes in the fall. GPLC offices in the East Suburbs and McKeesport will be adding math classes in the fall.

Although student skills were evaluated before and after the program, an official evaluation will not be completed until the end of the year. But the following letter from Sewickley student, Andrew T. Snow, indicates that the classes are meeting a need:

Dear Mark,

I think you are a fine teacher. You explain the problems to us and take the time to teach us. I think the Literacy Council should do more classes. I think better now and I can count a little better. I didn't know how to do division, but I do now. I've been wanting to take a class like this for a long time, but I didn't. I'm glad that I did now. I think if more people knew about these classes, I think they would join. Thank you for taking the time and energy to teach us. I'm glad I did it.

Your student,
Andrew T. Snow

Tutors

Please make your students aware that the GPLC Student Newsletter is looking for students to join the staff. A student does not have to be a writer to be on the staff. We need ideas, interest and the commitment of a few hours each month.

We also need writings for upcoming issues. Ask your students to send their stories, poems, book reviews, essays or opinions on any subject that interests them. They can sign their name, their initials or just "Student".

Submissions should be no longer than 250 words. Send them to us at the following address:

Student Newsletter Staff
Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council
100 Sheridan Square
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(EXHIBIT 4)

OPEN UP A LIFE.

GREATER PITTSBURGH LITERACY COUNCIL

VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITIES

There are many ways to participate in the work of the Literacy Council. The following is a brief outline of our agency's volunteer opportunities.

F R O M T H E A R E A O F F I C E

Administrative Assistant

Learn about the literacy council from the ground up. Assistance is needed in many different phases of office procedures. Two to eight hours monthly. Day or evening. Fourteen locations around Allegheny County.

Interviewer

Interview and administer reading assessment to incoming students. Retest active students at regularly scheduled intervals. Arrange appointments at mutually convenient times and locations. Three hours training. One interview per week (approximately 1 1/2 hours). Daytime or evening.

Public Speaker

Speak to community and church groups throughout Allegheny County. Three hours per month.

Public Relations Assistant and Fund Raiser

Spread the word about the great success that adult learners are having with GPLC. Get involved in special events to support our services. Time commitment negotiable.

Small-group Math/Spelling/Writing Tutor

Tutor a group of three to eight students. One session per week (approximately two hours). Must attend the twelve-hour tutor workshop and a three hour workshop in small group methods. (Pre-registration required)

Small-group Reading Tutor

Tutor a group of three to eight students in basic reading and writing skills. Meet twice weekly for 1 1/2 hour sessions. Team tutoring is encouraged. Must attend the 12-hour training workshop and a three hour workshop in small group methods. (Pre-registration required)

OPEN UP A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

MATH GROUP EVALUATION FORM

Math Tutor's Name _____

Date _____ Area _____

Please mark each of the items listed below. Use S for satisfactory or U for unsatisfactory. Please explain.

1. Site _
2. Room _
3. Day _
4. Time _
5. Class Size _
6. Textbook _
7. Supplementary Materials (books, puzzles, copy masters) _
8. Math Journal _
9. Math Tutor Training _
10. Total number of students who attended at least one class during this 12 week session. _____

    Did you contact the students who did not attend regularly? ___

    List reasons they gave for not attending regularly. _
11. What adjustments could you make in the next 12 week session to encourage all students to complete the course? _
12. Were you satisfied with the degree of communication between you and the reading tutors? _____ Explain. _____

(EXHIBIT 6)

A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

13. What problems did you encounter? _____

_____

_____

14. Based upon your experience during this session, please make suggestions for improving delivery of math instruction to GPLC's students.

_____

_____

_____

_____

AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

Please return completed form to Susan Evans
Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council
100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

OPEN UP A LIFE

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

MATH GROUP EVALUATION FORM

Reading Tutor's Name _____

Date _____ Area _____

1. Did you encourage your student to participate in the math class? _____

2. Did you have personal contact with the math tutor(s)? _____
   If yes, how was that contact made?

   _____

3. Was seeing the math journal helpful? _____

   Why/Why not? _____

4. Were you satisfied with the amount of communication between you and the math tutor(s)? _____

   If no, why not? _____

   _____

5. Have you noticed any change in your student's attitude, work habits, etc. since he/she began attending the math group? _____

   Please explain. _____

   _____

6. Comments _____

   _____

   _____

AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

Please return to: Susan Evans
100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(EXHIBIT 7)

OPEN UP A LIFE.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

100 Sheridan Square, 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

MATH GROUP EVALUATION FORM

Student's Name _____ Date _____

Area _____

Site (Building, location) _____

Room _____

Day _____

Time _____

Class Size _____

Textbook _____

Supplementary Materials _____

Journal _____

_____

Math Tutor 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Why did you join this math group? _____

_____

Did you accomplish that goal? _____

Will you continue to attend the math group? _____

_____

What did you like best? _____

_____

What did you like least? _____

_____

Comments/Suggestions _____

_____

(EXHIBIT 8)

M A T H J O U R N A L

Name _____

GOALS:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Date	
	Student: Math Tutor: Reading Tutor:
	S: MT: RT:
	S: MT: RT:
	S: MT: RT:

(EXHIBIT 9)

Date

S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	

Date

S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	
S: MT: RT:	

COMMENTS:

(EXHIBIT 10)

udent's Name _____ Phone _____

th Tutor's Name _____ Phone _____

eading Tutor's Name _____ Phone _____

ordinator's Name _____ Phone _____

ek One/Date _____ hrs. _____

esson: _____

eading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

ek Two/Date _____ hrs. _____

sson: _____

eading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

eek Three/Date _____ hrs. _____

sson: _____

eading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

ek Four/Date _____ hrs. _____

esson: _____

eading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

eek Five/Date _____ hrs. _____

sson: _____

ading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

eek Six/Date _____ hrs. _____

sson: _____

ading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Seven/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Eight/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Nine/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Ten/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Eleven/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

Week Twelve/Date _____ hrs. _____

Lesson: _____

Reading Tutor: Initial and/or Comment

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brigance, A. H., (1981). BRIGANCE DIAGNOSTIC INVENTORY OF ESSENTIAL SKILLS. North Billerica, Mass.: Curriculum Associates, Inc.

Cheatham, J., & Lawson, V. K., (1990). SMALL GROUP TUTORING, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH FOR LITERACY INSTRUCTION. Syracuse: Literacy Volunteers of America.